

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the non-final Official Action mailed February 17, 2010 (the "Office Action" or "Action"). Reconsideration of the application in light of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim Status:

No amendments to the claims are proposed by the present paper. Thus, claims 1-31 are currently pending for further action.

Prior Art:

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b):

1. In the recent Office Action, claims 1-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,141,693 to Perlman et al. (hereinafter Perlman). For at least the following reasons, this rejection should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 1:

Claim 1 recites:

A method for fitting a frame of a video feed to a display device, the method comprising:

ascertaining at least one marker defining a region of the frame, the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display device;

buffering at least one row of the region defined by the at least one marker and excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed; and

displaying, on the display device, the region of the frame defined by the at least one marker.

(Emphasis added).

In contrast, Perlman does not teach or suggest, “[a] method for fitting a frame of a video feed to a display device, the method comprising ascertaining at least one marker defining a region of the frame, the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display device, buffering at least one row of the region defined by the at least one marker and excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed, and displaying, on the display device, the region of the frame defined by the at least one marker.” (Claim 1).

Perlman generally discloses filtering of troublesome artifacts or features of a video image to produce a visually appealing image. (*See, e.g.*, Perlman, col. 9, ll. 17-20; Fig. 9). In order to achieve the purpose of the invention, Perlman teaches the following:

First, a *person* located at server 605 may view the input video stream and ***explicitly identify portions of any of the video images of the video stream that need to be selectively filtered.*** Using a conventional user interface the person may identify ***rectangular regions of a particular video frame that need to be filtered.*** The x, y coordinates of the selected region may be retained in memory in server 605 along with the frame number, sequence number, or synchronized time value corresponding to the video frame in which the selected region was identified. By repeating this process for each video frame in the video stream, ***the person may identify a set of video frames and a set of selected regions within those video frames for which filtering operations need to be performed.*** This set of frame identification and selected region information retained by server 605 forms the basis of the auxiliary data that is subsequently encoded into the video stream or retained in an off-line file by server 605.

(Perlman, col. 9, ll. 37-54) (emphasis added).

Further, Perlman teaches a cropping function that is used to eliminate the troublesome artifacts or features and eliminating the cropped portion. (*See*, Perlman, col. 11, ll. 54-67).

However, claim 1 recites, “ascertaining at least one marker defining a region of the frame.” On this point, Perlman teaches “identify[ing] rectangular regions of a particular

video frame *that need to be filtered.*” (Perlman, col. 9, ll. 41-43) (emphasis added). This cannot be interpreted as ascertaining a marker.

Further, claim 1 recites, “ascertaining at least one marker defining a region of the frame, *the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display device.*” (Claim 1) (emphasis added). Perlman is silent as to both the dimensions and resolution ratio of the identified rectangular region. Further, because Perlman does not teach or suggest that the rectangular region has a horizontal to vertical ratio that matches a horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of a display device, Perlman also cannot teach or suggest, “displaying, on the display device, the region of the frame defined by the at least one marker.” (Claim 1).

Further, Perlman does not teach or suggest, “excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed.” (Claim 1). In fact, as alluded to above, *Perlman teaches the opposite* where it states, “the region specified by the crop function 1605 [(the rectangular region)] *is eliminated from the video frame* identified by frame number 1003.” (Perlman, co. 11, ll. 65-67). In other words, Perlman explicitly eliminates portions of the video frame *inside* the selected portion.

In contrast, claim 1 recites, “[a] method for fitting a frame of a video feed to a display device, the method comprising ascertaining at least one marker defining a region of the frame, the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display device, buffering at least one row of the region defined by the at least one marker and excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed, and displaying, on the display device, the region of the frame

defined by the at least one marker.” This subject matter is clearly not taught or suggested by Perlman.

Respectfully, to anticipate a claim, a reference must teach each and every element of the claim, and “the identical invention must be shown *in as complete detail as contained in the ... claim.*” MPEP 2131 citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 2 USPQ2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1987) and *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (emphasis added). Moreover, “[t]he prior art reference—in order to anticipate under 35 U.S.C. § 102—must not only disclose all elements of the claim within the four corners of the document, but must also disclose those elements ‘arranged as in the claim.’” *NetMoneyIn v. Verisign*, (Fed. Cir. 2008) (quoting *Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 722 F.2d 1542 (Fed. Cir. 1983)).

In the present case, Perlman clearly does not disclose the claimed invention with each and every claimed element in the same amount of detail or as arranged in the claim. Consequently, because Perlman clearly fails to satisfy the requirements for anticipating claim 1, the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 9:

Claim 9 recites:

A method for transmitting a video feed to a display device, the method comprising:

adding, to the video feed, at least one marker defining a region of the frame, the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display device;

transmitting the video feed to the display device;

parsing the at least one marker from the video feed;

buffering at least one row of the region defined by the at least one marker and *excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed;* and

displaying, on the display device, the region of the frame defined by the at least one marker.
(Emphasis added).

As similarly argued above in connection with the patentability of independent claim 1, Perlman does not teach or suggest, “[a] method for transmitting a video feed to a display device, the method comprising adding, to the video feed, at least one marker defining a region of the frame, the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display device, transmitting the video feed to the display device, parsing the at least one marker from the video feed, buffering at least one row of the region defined by the at least one marker and excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed, and displaying, on the display device, the region of the frame defined by the at least one marker.”

The Office Action argues, “Perlman further shows an adding step (501, 605, 705), and a transmitting step (709).” (Action, p. 3). However, Applicant respectfully disagrees. Elements 501, 605, and 705 of Perlman are a video source and servers respectively. (Perlman, col. 6, l. 43 through col. 7, l. 60). In one embodiment taught in Perlman, the “video source 501 takes raw video input and combines the raw video input with an auxiliary data input channel to produce a video stream including auxiliary data 503.” (Perlman, col. 6, ll. 62-65). However, Perlman is silent regarding the video source adding a marker defining a region of a frame as recited in claim 9. In a similar manner, Perlman teaches a “server 605 includes a video processor 607,” in which the “[v]ideo processor 607 is responsible for receiving the video stream 603 and combining auxiliary data with video stream 603 to produce video stream 609 including auxiliary data.” Clearly, the video processor of Perlman

is not configured to add a marker defining a region of a frame as recited in claim 9, but instead simply configured to combine auxiliary data and a video stream.

In contrast, claim 9 recites, “adding, to the video feed, *at least one marker defining a region of the frame.*” This subject matter is clearly not taught or suggested by Perlman.

Further, in light of the above, it is also clear that the video source and servers of Perlman do not teach or suggest, “adding . . . at least one marker defining a region of the frame, *the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display device.*” (Claim 9) (emphasis added). As discussed above, Perlman is silent as to both the dimensions and resolution ratio of the identified rectangular region, and as to matching and displaying the region of the frame defined by a marker. (Claim 9).

Further, Perlman does not teach or suggest, “parsing the at least one marker from the video feed.” (Claim 9). The Office Action fails to specify where within Perlman this recitation is taught. Also, Perlman does not teach or suggest parsing any video feed for any components.

Further, Perlman does not teach or suggest, “excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed.” (Claim 9). As similarly discussed above in connection with the patentability of independent claim 1, *Perlman teaches the opposite* where it states, “the region specified by the crop function 1605 [(the rectangular region)] *is eliminated from the video frame* identified by frame number 1003.” (Perlman, co. 11, ll. 65-67).

In contrast, claim 9 recites, “[a] method for transmitting a video feed to a display device, the method comprising adding, to the video feed, at least one marker defining a region

of the frame, the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display device, transmitting the video feed to the display device, parsing the at least one marker from the video feed, buffering at least one row of the region defined by the at least one marker and excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed, and displaying, on the display device, the region of the frame defined by the at least one marker.” This subject matter is clearly not taught or suggested by Perlman.

Again, to anticipate a claim, a reference must teach each and every element of the claim, and “the identical invention must be shown *in as complete detail as contained in the ... claim.*” MPEP 2131 citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 2 USPQ2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1987) and *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (emphasis added). Moreover, “[t]he prior art reference—in order to anticipate under 35 U.S.C. § 102—must not only disclose all elements of the claim within the four corners of the document, but must also disclose those elements ‘arranged as in the claim.’” *NetMoneyIn v. Verisign*, (Fed. Cir. 2008) (quoting *Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 722 F.2d 1542 (Fed. Cir. 1983)).

In the present case, Perlman clearly does not disclose the claimed invention with each and every claimed element in the same amount of detail or as arranged in the claim. Consequently, because Perlman clearly fails to satisfy the requirements for anticipating claim 9, the rejection of claim 9 and its dependent claims should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 12:

Claim 12 recites:

A display device for displaying a video feed, the display device comprising:
a display area having horizontal and vertical resolutions;
a parser configured to parse at least one marker from the video feed,
the at least one marker defining a region of a frame of the video feed, *the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display area;*
a buffer configured to selectively store rows of the region defined by the at least one marker and exclude rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed; and
a video controller configured to display, in the display area, the buffered rows.

(Emphasis added).

Again, as similarly argued above in connection with the patentability of independent claims 1 and 9, Perlman does not teach or suggest, “[a] display device for displaying a video feed, the display device comprising a display area having horizontal and vertical resolutions, a parser configured to parse at least one marker from the video feed, the at least one marker defining a region of a frame of the video feed, the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display area, a buffer configured to selectively store rows of the region defined by the at least one marker and exclude rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed, and a video controller configured to display, in the display area, the buffered rows.” (Claim 12).

Perlman does not teach or suggest, “a parser configured to parse at least one marker from the video feed.” (Claim 12). The Office Action fails to specify where within Perlman is taught a parser. Also, Perlman does not teach or suggest parsing any video feed for any components, including a marker as recited in claim 12.

Further, as argued above, it is clear that Perlman does not teach or suggest, “a parser configured to parse at least one marker from the video feed, the at least one marker defining a region of a frame of the video feed, *the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display area*” (Claim 12) (emphasis added). As discussed above, Perlman is silent as to both the dimensions and resolution ratio of the identified rectangular region, and as to matching and displaying the region defined by a marker. (Claim 12).

Finally, Perlman does not teach or suggest, “a buffer configured to . . . exclude rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed.” (Claim 12). The Office Action argues that the “client device [of Perlman] 820 . . . inherently includes a video memory or buffer for buffering the processed video data (col. 8, lines 18-25).” (Action, p. 2). However, the Office Action does not address the recitation of claim 12 regarding, “exclude[ing] rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed.” (Claim 12). In fact, as discussed above in connection with the patentability of independent claims 1 and 9, *Perlman teaches the opposite* where it states, “the region specified by the crop function 1605 [(the rectangular region)] *is eliminated from the video frame* identified by frame number 1003.” (Perlman, co. 11, ll. 65-67).

In contrast, claim 12 recites, “[a] display device for displaying a video feed, the display device comprising a display area having horizontal and vertical resolutions, a parser configured to parse at least one marker from the video feed, the at least one marker defining a region of a frame of the video feed, the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display area, a buffer configured to

selectively store rows of the region defined by the at least one marker and exclude rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed, and a video controller configured to display, in the display area, the buffered rows.” This subject matter is clearly not taught or suggested by Perlman.

Again, to anticipate a claim, a reference must teach each and every element of the claim, and “the identical invention must be shown *in as complete detail as contained in the ... claim.*” MPEP 2131 citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 2 USPQ2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1987) and *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (emphasis added). Moreover, “[t]he prior art reference—in order to anticipate under 35 U.S.C. § 102—must not only disclose all elements of the claim within the four corners of the document, but must also disclose those elements ‘arranged as in the claim.’” *NetMoneyIn v. Verisign*, (Fed. Cir. 2008) (quoting *Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 722 F.2d 1542 (Fed. Cir. 1983)).

In the present case, Perlman clearly does not disclose the claimed invention with each and every claimed element in the same amount of detail or as arranged in the claim. Consequently, because Perlman clearly fails to satisfy the requirements for anticipating claim 12, the rejection of claim 12 and its dependent claims should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 16:

Claim 16 recites:

A display device for displaying a video feed, the display device comprising:
a display area having horizontal and vertical resolutions;
means for ascertaining at least one marker defining a region of the frame, the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display device;

a buffer;

means for storing in the buffer at least one row of the region defined by the at least one marker and *excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed*; and

means for displaying, on the display device, the region of the frame defined by the at least one marker.

(Emphasis added).

Again, as similarly argued above in connection with the patentability of independent claims 1, 9 and 12, Perlman does not teach or suggest, “[a] display device for displaying a video feed, the display device comprising a display area having horizontal and vertical resolutions, means for ascertaining at least one marker defining a region of the frame, the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display device, a buffer, means for storing in the buffer at least one row of the region defined by the at least one marker and excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed, and means for displaying, on the display device, the region of the frame defined by the at least one marker.” (Claim 16).

Perlman does not teach or suggest, “means for ascertaining at least one marker defining a region of the frame.” (Claim 16). Perlman teaches “identify[ing] rectangular regions of a particular video frame *that need to be filtered*.” (Perlman, col. 9, ll. 41-43) (emphasis added). This cannot be interpreted as ascertaining a marker.

Further, Perlman does not teach or suggest, “means for ascertaining at least one marker defining a region of the frame, *the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display device*.” (Claim 16) (emphasis added). Perlman is silent as to both the dimensions and resolution ratio of the identified rectangular region, and, therefore, is silent regarding matching a horizontal to

vertical ratio to a horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of a display device. Further, for this reason, Perlman also cannot teach or suggest, “means for displaying, on the display device, the region of the frame defined by the at least one marker.” (Claim 16).

Finally, Perlman does not teach or suggest, “means for excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed.” (Claim 16). In fact, as similarly argued above, *Perlman teaches the opposite* where it states, “the region specified by the crop function 1605 [(the rectangular region)] *is eliminated from the video frame* identified by frame number 1003.” (Perlman, co. 11, ll. 65-67).

In contrast, claim 16 recites, “[a] display device for displaying a video feed, the display device comprising a display area having horizontal and vertical resolutions, means for ascertaining at least one marker defining a region of the frame, the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display device, a buffer, means for storing in the buffer at least one row of the region defined by the at least one marker and excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed, and means for displaying, on the display device, the region of the frame defined by the at least one marker.” This subject matter is clearly not taught or suggested by Perlman.

Again, to anticipate a claim, a reference must teach each and every element of the claim, and “the identical invention must be shown *in as complete detail as contained in the ... claim.*” MPEP 2131 citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 2 USPQ2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1987) and *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (emphasis added). Moreover, “[t]he prior art reference—in

order to anticipate under 35 U.S.C. § 102—must not only disclose all elements of the claim within the four corners of the document, but must also disclose those elements ‘arranged as in the claim.’” *NetMoneyIn v. Verisign*, (Fed. Cir. 2008) (quoting *Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 722 F.2d 1542 (Fed. Cir. 1983)).

In the present case, Perlman clearly does not disclose the claimed invention with each and every claimed element in the same amount of detail or as arranged in the claim. Consequently, because Perlman clearly fails to satisfy the requirements for anticipating claim 16, the rejection of claim 16 and its dependent claims should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 24:

Claim 24 recites:

A program storage system readable by a computer, tangibly embodying a program, applet, or instructions executable by the computer to perform method steps for fitting a frame of a video feed to a display device, the method comprising:

ascertaining at least one marker defining a region of the frame, the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display device;

buffering at least one row of the region defined by the at least one marker and ***excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed;*** and

displaying, on the display device, the region of the frame defined by the at least one marker.

(Emphasis added).

Again, as similarly argued above in connection with the patentability of independent claims 1, 9, 12, and 16, Perlman does not teach or suggest, “[a] program storage system readable by a computer, tangibly embodying a program, applet, or instructions executable by the computer to perform method steps for fitting a frame of a video feed to a display device, the method comprising ascertaining at least one marker defining a region of the frame, the

region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display device, buffering at least one row of the region defined by the at least one marker and excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed, and displaying, on the display device, the region of the frame defined by the at least one marker.” (Claim 24).

First, Perlman does not teach or suggest, “ascertaining at least one marker defining a region of the frame.” (Claim 24). Perlman teaches “identify[ing] rectangular regions of a particular video frame *that need to be filtered.*” (Perlman, col. 9, ll. 41-43) (emphasis added). This cannot be interpreted as ascertaining a marker.

Further, Perlman does not teach or suggest, “ascertaining at least one marker defining a region of the frame, *the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display device.*” (Claim 24) (emphasis added). Perlman is silent as to both the dimensions and resolution ratio of the identified rectangular region, and, therefore, is silent regarding matching a horizontal to vertical ratio to a horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of a display device. Further, for this reason, Perlman also cannot teach or suggest, “displaying, on the display device, the region of the frame defined by the at least one marker.” (Claim 24).

Finally, Perlman does not teach or suggest, “excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed.” (Claim 24). In fact, as similarly argued above, *Perlman teaches the opposite* where it states, “the region specified by the crop function 1605 [(the rectangular region)] *is eliminated from the video frame* identified by frame number 1003.” (Perlman, co. 11, ll. 65-67).

In contrast, claim 24 recites, “[a] program storage system readable by a computer, tangibly embodying a program, applet, or instructions executable by the computer to perform method steps for fitting a frame of a video feed to a display device, the method comprising ascertaining at least one marker defining a region of the frame, the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display device, buffering at least one row of the region defined by the at least one marker and excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed, and displaying, on the display device, the region of the frame defined by the at least one marker.” This subject matter is clearly not taught or suggested by Perlman.

Again, to anticipate a claim, a reference must teach each and every element of the claim, and “the identical invention must be shown *in as complete detail as contained in the ... claim.*” MPEP 2131 citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 2 USPQ2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1987) and *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (emphasis added). Moreover, “[t]he prior art reference—in order to anticipate under 35 U.S.C. § 102—must not only disclose all elements of the claim within the four corners of the document, but must also disclose those elements ‘arranged as in the claim.’” *NetMoneyIn v. Verisign*, (Fed. Cir. 2008) (quoting *Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 722 F.2d 1542 (Fed. Cir. 1983)).

In the present case, Perlman clearly does not disclose the claimed invention with each and every claimed element in the same amount of detail or as arranged in the claim. Consequently, because Perlman clearly fails to satisfy the requirements for anticipating claim 24, the rejection of claim 24 and its dependent claims should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Additionally, various dependent claims of the application recite subject matter that is further patentable over the cited prior art. Specific, non-exclusive examples follow.

Claims 4, 19, and 27:

Claim 3 recites: “[t]he method of claim 1 wherein ascertaining at least one marker includes ***fixing the at least one marker for each video feed.***” (Emphasis added). Claims 19 and 27 recite similar subject matter. In contrast, Perlman does not teach or suggest, “fixing the at least one marker for each video feed.” (Claims 4, 19, and 27).

The Office Action, without presenting arguments or explanation, simply cites to column 8, lines 35-54 of Perlman. (Action, p. 2). However, it is unclear how this cited portion of Perlman teaches or suggests “fixing the at least one marker for each video feed.” The cited portion of Perlman simply teaches the deficient processing capabilities of many types of client devices. Nowhere does Perlman teach or suggest fixing a marker to each video feed.

Again, to anticipate a claim, a reference must teach each and every element of the claim, and “the identical invention must be shown ***in as complete detail as contained in the ... claim.***” MPEP 2131 citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 2 USPQ2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1987) and *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (emphasis added). Moreover, “[t]he prior art reference—in order to anticipate under 35 U.S.C. § 102—must not only disclose all elements of the claim within the four corners of the document, but must also disclose those elements ‘arranged as in the claim.’” *NetMoneyIn v. Verisign*, (Fed. Cir. 2008) (quoting *Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 722 F.2d 1542 (Fed. Cir. 1983)).

In the present case, Perlman clearly does not disclose the claimed invention with each and every claimed element in the same amount of detail or as arranged in the claim. Consequently, because Perlman clearly fails to satisfy the requirements for anticipating claims 4, 19, and 27, the rejection of claims 4, 19, and 27 should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 5, 13, 20, and 28:

Claim 5 recites “[t]he method of claim 1 wherein ascertaining at least one marker includes ascertaining a single marker defining a first corner of the region and calculating from the single marker and the horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio a second corner opposite the first corner of the region.” Claims 13, 20, and 28 recite similar subject matter. Regarding this subject matter, the Office Action, without presenting arguments or explanation, simply cites to column 11, lines 54-67 of Perlman. (Action, p. 2). However, this cited portion of Perlman teaches a cropping function that eliminates regions within the video frame. As similarly argued above in favor of the patentability of independent claims 1, 9, 12, 16, and 24, Perlman teaches the opposite of claims 5, 13, 20, and 28 by explicitly eliminating portions of the video frame *inside* the selected portion.

Further, Perlman does not teach or suggest, “calculating from the single marker and the horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio a second corner opposite the first corner of the region.” (Claims 5, 13, 20, and 28). As argued above, Perlman is silent as to both the dimensions and resolution ratio of the identified rectangular region or a horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of a display device. Therefore, Perlman cannot teach or suggest calculating from the single marker and the horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio a second corner opposite the first corner of the region.

In contrast, claims 5, 13, 20, and 28 recite, “ascertaining a single marker defining a first corner of the region and calculating from the single marker and the horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio a second corner opposite the first corner of the region.” This subject matter is clearly not taught or suggested by Perlman.

Respectfully, to anticipate a claim, a reference must teach each and every element of the claim, and “the identical invention must be shown *in as complete detail as contained in the ... claim.*” MPEP 2131 citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 2 USPQ2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1987) and *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (emphasis added). Moreover, “[t]he prior art reference—in order to anticipate under 35 U.S.C. § 102—must not only disclose all elements of the claim within the four corners of the document, but must also disclose those elements ‘arranged as in the claim.’” *NetMoneyIn v. Verisign*, (Fed. Cir. 2008) (quoting *Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 722 F.2d 1542 (Fed. Cir. 1983)).

In the present case, Perlman clearly does not disclose the claimed invention with each and every claimed element in the same amount of detail or as arranged in the claim. Consequently, because Perlman clearly fails to satisfy the requirements for anticipating claims 5, 13, 20, and 28, the rejection of claims 5, 13, 20, and 28 should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion:

In view of the preceding arguments, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance over the prior art of record. Therefore, this response is believed to be a complete response to the Office Action. However, Applicant reserves the right to set forth further arguments in future papers supporting the patentability of any of the claims, including the

separate patentability of the dependent claims not explicitly addressed herein. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed.

The absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue, or comment in the Office Action does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment. Further, for any instances in which the Examiner took Official Notice in the Office Action, Applicants expressly do not acquiesce to the taking of Official Notice, and respectfully request that the Examiner provide an affidavit to support the Official Notice taken in the next Office Action, as required by 37 CFR 1.104(d)(2) and MPEP § 2144.03.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions which could place this application in better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

DATE: May 11, 2010

/Steven L. Nichols/
Steven L. Nichols
Registration No. 40,326

STEVEN L. NICHOLS
Director, Intellectual Property Practice Group
VANCOTT PC
36 SOUTH STATE STREET, SUITE 1900
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111
P 801.237.0251
M 801.414.0750
F 801.237.0853
E snichols@vancott.com